



September 17, 2002

Mr. Joe A. De Los Santos
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246-0606

OR2002-5216

Dear Mr. De Los Santos:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 168628.

The Natalia Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for legal fees incurred by the district related to Docket No. 019-R5-1001 and uniform exemption requests. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

With regard to the submitted fee bills, we note that the fee bills are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Under section 552.022, attorney fee bills must be released unless they are expressly confidential under other law. Sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4-5 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111).

However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). We note that our office has previously determined that "information [which] may be privileged in the civil discovery context . . . may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code." Open Records Decision Nos. 647 at 2 (1996), 575 at 2 (1990) (stating explicitly that discovery privileges are not covered under the predecessor to section 552.101). Thus, we will determine only whether the submitted information is excepted under Rule 503.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *See* Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Thus, to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the privileged information is confidential under Rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ); *see also* Tex. R. Evid. 511 (waiver of privilege by voluntary disclosure).

Based on our review of your arguments and the submitted attorney billing statements, we conclude that you have demonstrated that some of the marked portions of the billing statements are encompassed by the attorney-client privilege and, therefore, may be withheld from disclosure pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have marked the information the district may withhold under rule 503.

You also contend that portions of the attorney billing statements are protected under the attorney work product privilege. An attorney’s work product is confidential under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Work product is defined as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material, communication, or mental impression was created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. *Id.* Information that meets the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege

enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

In this instance, you have failed to demonstrate that any portions of the attorney fee bills were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. We thus find that none of the submitted information constitutes attorney work product that may be withheld from the public pursuant to rule 192.5. The remaining information contained in the fee bills must therefore be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be

sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 168628

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeffery Clark
111 PR 6750
Devine, Texas 78016
(w/o enclosures)